

3218

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 17, 1966

The Texan-by-adoption, who looked like a polished cowboy and wore bushy white sideburns, has been recognized by many as the idea man behind the Marshall plan after World War II.

He was a financial backer of the Liberty League that fought the New Deal in the 1930's. But in 1940 he joined the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs under Nelson A. Rockefeller, and later became a deputy to Jesse Jones, then Federal Loan Administrator. He was named Assistant Secretary of Commerce in charge of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's foreign activities and, as such, headed several of its wartime subsidiaries and was vice president of the Export-Import Bank.

Early in 1944 he resigned his Commerce post to become War Surplus Administrator, to handle disposal of Government plants and surplus material after the war. He resigned as Administrator 8 months later after Congress repudiated his ideas on the sale of Federal real estate.

OPINION OF CARTELS

During hearings on his appointment as Assistant Secretary of State, Congress made clear it had not forgotten the dispute that preceded his withdrawal as Surplus Administrator. He was asked:

"How do you feel about cartels?" and "What are your business connections?" On cartels, Mr. Clayton shot back: "A cartel smells the same to me by whatever name it may be called." To the other, often-asked question, he replied that he received daily reports of the total sales and transactions of Anderson, Clayton & Co., which "are thrown in the wastebasket." His frankness impressed the Senators and they approved his nomination.

When diplomacy became inextricably interwoven with economics in the final months of World War II, Mr. Clayton was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs in December 1944, to keep the diplomatic and economic fields coordinated within the State Department.

Twenty months later he was elevated to the higher post of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Although a neophyte diplomat at the start of his State Department days, Mr. Clayton carried on and developed the reciprocal trade policies inaugurated by Cordell Hull. In reply to Congressional criticism of his big business background and trading policies, Mr. Clayton always contended that he was laboring for the good of his country, not for any private business interests.

As a cotton merchant, Mr. Clayton traveled in many countries and acquired early the international viewpoint that made him one of the chief architects of the postwar foreign policy of the United States. His observations in Europe and as his country's representative at the Geneva Trade Conference in 1945-46 produced the memorandum to Secretary of State George C. Marshall that was one of the principal bases of the Marshall plan—a plan for the economic recovery of war-torn Europe.

WORKED FOR COURT CLERK

Will Clayton was born in Tupelo, Miss. He moved with his family to Jackson, Tenn., and at 13 he left school and went to work in a local court clerk's office. He became a deputy clerk at 15, studied shorthand and became a court reporter. Among his clients was William Jennings Bryan.

Still in his teens, he became stenographer to a cotton broker. He went to New York seeking advancement, and got a job with the American Cotton Co. and rose in that company to the post of assistant general manager.

In 1904, with his brothers-in-law, Frank D. and M. E. Anderson, he formed Anderson, Clayton & Co., which moved its operations to

Houston in 1917 so that it would have available the facilities of a deepwater port. Mr. Clayton temporarily withdrew from the company in 1918 to become a member of the Committee of Cotton Distribution for the War Industries Board.

In 1961, Mr. Clayton agreed with Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in discussion before a Senate-House economic committee, that the United States should make some arrangement with the European Common Market or split the non-Communist world and vastly strengthen the Soviet Union and its allies. "Together," they agreed, "Western Europe and North America can forge a free world economic system which nothing can equal and the power of which nothing can threaten."

With Christian A. Herter, who succeeded John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State in the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Clayton was named in 1962 as cochairman of a congressionally appointed Citizens Commission on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The creation of a permanent high council and a high court of justice for the nations of the organization were subsequently among the chief recommendations submitted to Congress by the group.

In the same year, Mr. Clayton was one of 21 American business leaders who, in full-page newspaper advertisements, appealed for a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons.

Until close to the end of his life, Mr. Clayton kept himself in good physical condition. He was a proficient horseman, and he worked regularly with Indian clubs in a home gymnasium. During his years in Washington he customarily walked from his home in Rock Creek Park to the State Department Building.

In 1903, Mr. Clayton married a Kentucky girl, Susan Vaughan. She died in 1960. Four daughters survive.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is once again my privilege to mark and honor the declaration of Lithuanian Independence Day. This declaration was made 48 years ago, and the great Lithuanian people have never ceased to courageously fight for their freedom. Despite these long years of Communist rule, the Lithuanian people have not lost their strong sense of what liberty means. Their struggle still stands as a symbol to other nations yearning to be free.

After years of subjugation by Russia, and after the German occupation of World War I, the Lithuanian people declared the establishment of an independent Lithuania on February 16, 1918. Russia again moved in by the end of that year, only to discover once again that the Lithuanian people would fight. Because of this, the Soviet Union was forced to recognize Lithuania as a sovereign state in 1920.

But this brief respite was too short lived. In 1940, Soviet troops once again occupied the country and annexed it. And history further repeated itself with another German occupation until 1944. In 1944, Soviet troops again crushed Lithuanian uprisings.

For more than 7 years during and after the war, the Lithuanian people fought for their own country. Thirty thousand Lithuanian people died in this cause, and many more were deported to the Soviet Union only to die in Soviet concentration camps.

The Lithuanian people should never

abandon hope for a truly independent state. We, in the United States, who know what freedom is, commemorate their courage and the principle for which they stand: Freedom and self-determination.

IN SUPPORT OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO OVERSEE THE CIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the time has come for the Congress to exercise legislative oversight on the intelligence community generally and the CIA in particular in a consistent, formal, continuing, and responsible way. Since the CIA was instituted in 1949 as a part of the National Security Council, the Congress has proscribed itself by statute from checking the activities of the CIA to the extent that Congress normally oversees governmental policy. As a result, the activities of the CIA are monitored by the Congress only in a limited way and this monitoring is done by a number of congressional committees, but mainly in the appropriations process.

Before elaborating on the need for a Joint Congressional Committee on the Central Intelligence Agency as proposed by Senator Young, from Ohio, I should like to review the statutory background and congressional committee responsibility as regard the CIA.

In the National Security Act of 1947, Congress made the Director of the CIA responsible for "protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure." In the CIA Act of 1949, Congress specifically exempted the CIA from existing statutes which required all governmental agencies to publish "the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or number of personnel" which they employed. The act also forbade the Director of the Budget from issuing the usual reports to Congress.

In 1956, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] moved to establish a joint committee, but his bill was defeated on the floor of the Senate by 59 to 27. Subsequent bills have been introduced, but they have all died in committee. Recognizing the necessity and importance of intelligence activities, Congress has deliberately tied its own hands in an attempt to maintain the security and integrity of the CIA.

Rather than establish a joint committee, Congress has decided to oversee the CIA through a variety of separate committees. There are at least six different committees in both House of Congress which monitor the CIA to greater and lesser degrees: the House and Senate Appropriations Committee, the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, and the Senate Foreign Relations and the House Foreign Affairs Committees. None of these committees has the time or the inclination to probe the CIA carefully and deeply, except in cases of sensational events such as the U-2 flights and the Cuban missile crisis.

Most Americans recognize the need for intelligence agencies in a dangerous world; most Americans also recognize the need for security in these matters.

February 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3219

We in Congress also appreciate the fine job now being done with the CIA by the various congressional committees. But there is a need for line authority and responsibility in exercising the legislative oversight function of the Congress. The joint committee proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] seems to fit the bill, for the following reasons:

First, Intelligence gathering is a major operation in foreign policy and national security affairs, involving the expenditure of vast amount of funds.

Second, Intelligence agencies sometimes find themselves making policy rather than simply executing it. This sometimes occurs without conscious design on the part of the intelligence agency either because policy directives from above do not exist in certain areas or because the CIA has people on the scene when the action happens who are not responsible to the local ambassadors. By force of circumstance, then, the work of the CIA sometimes in effect creates the policy where the President has not acted or even had a chance to act. There must be accountability to Congress for these on-the-spot decisions.

Third, The intelligence field is broad and complicated. Congress needs expertise on these matters, and the staff of the joint committee would be a step in that direction.

Congress has demonstrated restraint and reliability in past cooperation with the executive branch in respect of intelligence. The Joint Atomic Energy Committee is a good example of this. There is little reason for the executive branch to fear that Congress through the joint committee would now abuse this privilege. Congress has the responsibility to exercise legislative oversight over future intelligence operations and activities on a closer, continuing, and formal basis. For these reasons, I join with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] in cosponsoring S. 2815, a bill to establish a Joint Committee on the Central Intelligence Agency.

PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a forthcoming meeting in the Philippines which will have significant effect on our relations with the Philippines. Philippine-American friendship from time to time is taken for granted, or even overlooked. This relationship, forged before Philippine independence, has survived a war and has been strengthened through the years. I do not mean to suggest that there have been no irritants in our relationship, nor that there are none now. Innumerable differences have arisen which could have weakened the bonds between our two countries. Nevertheless, the benefits of the friendship and the mutuality of interest have caused us to work just a little harder to resolve these disagreements before they reached the danger point.

There are probably many explanations for the strong bonds of friendship that exist between our two peoples—so unlike each other in culture, history, and temperament. They are all probably

correct. How they were forged is not so important as how they are kept strong. Filipinos and Americans, both, have continued this friendship on the government level, through the trade that flows between our two countries, and in the cultural exchange that draws us closer together. We all owe a debt of gratitude to these people for without their determination, the traditional ties might have weakened.

Less than 3 years ago, prominent citizens of both countries established the American-Philippine Society, a nonprofit and nonpolitical organization devoted to clarifying and elevating United States-Philippine understanding.

The first honorary chairman of the society was Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Mr. MacArthur has succeeded her husband and shares his desire to perpetuate the good will between the two countries. Other prominent Americans and Filipinos—Howard Cullman, chairman of the New York Port Authority; George S. Moore, president of the First National City Bank; Miss Helena Benitez, Philippine educator and diplomat; and Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Secretary of Education, are among the society's officers.

The society was organized for the purpose of promoting intercultural relations between the peoples of the two nations through the mutual exchange of persons, groups, exhibits, and publications and through the presentation of lectures, forums, and similar media with respect to education and the humanities; namely, music, dance, language, and other art forms. It also seeks the clarification and elevation of United States-Philippine understanding through conferences by leaders of both countries.

The society's first major project is such a conference on the future of United States-Philippine relations soon to take place in Davao, in the Philippines, on February 23 to 26. The conference will be under the direction of the American Assembly, an affiliate of Columbia University established in 1950 by Dwight D. Eisenhower when he was president of the university.

The assembly at Davao, the first binational meeting of its kind under the American Assembly, will bring together a group of distinguished Filipinos and Americans to discuss social, political, military, and economic ties between the two countries.

In small discussion groups these Filipino and American representatives of government, industry, finance, labor, the humanities, science, and the press will consider the full range of problems of United States-Philippine relations. They will hear formal addresses by three persons of stature. On the fourth day, in plenary session, the participants will draw upon their own experiences and knowledge to review a final report of conclusions and recommendations for the improvement of Philippine and United States relations. As is the practice for these assemblies, the statement will be issued immediately to the press and then printed for distribution in both nations. It is expected that this consideration of questions such as military bases and mutual security, foreign policy, and the

Laurel-Langley agreement will be repeated in subsequent regional assemblies in both nations.

I hope that their conclusions and recommendations will receive the most serious consideration by both our governments. We would be negligent if we did not listen to this distinguished group of Filipinos and Americans. I shall await their report eagerly and hope that my colleagues in these Chambers and in the Philippine Congress will accept the report as the judgments of responsible men seeking to perpetuate a friendship which has been mutually advantageous. I also hope that by giving this dialog the importance it deserves, we will encourage the organizations of other binational assemblies.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO PURCHASE OF SURPLUS OR USED EQUIPMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record three resolutions adopted by the three counties of Delaware, Ontario, and Essex, in my State, dealing with the purchase of surplus or used equipment.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Briggs offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

"RESOLUTION NO. 24—RESOLUTION RELATING TO PURCHASE OF SURPLUS OR USED EQUIPMENT

"Whereas counties and towns frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment, the use of which will be for a limited time and surplus machinery and equipment or used machinery and equipment would be adequate and the ability of a county or town to purchase at reduced prices would result in considerable savings to taxpayers; and

"Whereas the State finance law permits the office of general services to sell surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers who then offer the same items for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price; and

"Whereas the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of particular items is through the local office of civil defense; and

"Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of this board that such surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities, and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Be it

"Resolved, That the board of supervisors of the county of Delaware hereby urges the legislature to amend the State finance law, the general municipal law and other applicable statutes to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment for sale to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as trucks, power tools, bulldozers, cranes, and other heavy equipment, and the price established for such item, and that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city and village and that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the price indicated on the inventory and